

PR

3848

RECORD  
COPY

JPRS: 3848

7 September 1960

MAIN FILE

THE INNER UNITY OF MARXISM-LENINISM

THE INNER UNITY OF MARXISM-LENINISM

THE INNER UNITY OF MARXISM-LENINISM

THE INNER UNITY OF MARXISM-LENINISM

- Czechoslovakia -

THE INNER UNITY OF MARXISM-LENINISM

by Indrich Srovnal

RETURN TO MAIN FILE

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A  
Approved for Public Release  
Distribution Unlimited

Photocopies of this report may be purchased from:

PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE  
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS  
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

Reproduced From  
Best Available Copy

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE  
205 EAST 42nd STREET, SUITE 300  
NEW YORK 17, N.Y.

19991007 083

## FOREWORD

This publication was prepared under contract by the UNITED STATES JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE, a federal government organization established to service the translation and research needs of the various government departments.

JPRS: 3848

CSO: 3783-D

## THE INNER UNITY OF MARXISM-LENINISM

### IN THE WORKS OF ITS CLASSICS

- Czechoslovakia -

[Following is a translation of an article by  
Indrich Sróvna in the Czech-language periodical  
Nova Mysl (The New Thought), Prague, No. 4,  
April 1960, pages 383-395.]

To fulfill the task of completing the building of socialism as it has been laid before our people by the 11th Congress of the KSC (Communist Party of Czechoslovakia), is to fill the objective social process--the practical development of which affects, starting with economics, all socially important spheres of life--with conscious activity of the working masses. With the growing initiative of the masses, the cognitive activity of the party and its Central Committee, without which a purposeful control of social processes would be unthinkable, assumes an ever greater significance. The policy of the Communist Party reaches into all social spheres, and yet in all its diversifications this policy is internally uniform; it is a manifestation of the united will which expresses the fundamental interests of the working people. The theoretical foundation of this internal unity of policy is the integral teaching of Marxism-Leninism. Only with this method and on its firm foundation can the party, widely teaching rich experiences, set forth aims for the practical activities of the masses. But together with the growth of a variety of social processes which must be penetrated in all their aspects, and together with the development of the cognitive and directive role of the party in various spheres of social life, grow also the demands for conscious deepening and theoretical solidification of the inner unity of the three parts of Marxism-Leninism. The practical party workers are very well aware of this fact, but theoretical workers do not always fully realize it.

\* \* \*

"Marx was the continuer and the genius completer of the three main currents of 19th Century thought which belong to the three most advanced countries of the world: the classic German philosophy, the classic English political economy, and French socialism, together with French revolutionary ideas in general."

In these words Lenin characterizes the ideological contents of Marxism in his article "Karl Marx." He also emphasizes here a "remarkable thoroughness and integrity" of the works of Marx. (V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 21, p. 44.)

When we have in mind the endeavors of Marx and Engels to transcend German classic philosophy, then we speak about the revolutionary turn in philosophy. But we can speak with equal right about Marx's and Engels' revolutionary turn in the history of economic theory and in the development of socialist and communist teachings. In this sense we then understand Marx's and Engels' works as a "direct and immediate continuation of the teachings of the greatest representatives of philosophy, political economy, and socialism." (V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 19, p. 11.)

The revolution of Marx and Engels, as it was carried out in those three most important currents of European thought, is the work of their genius. It could never have been realized, however, had not this genius of the modern science of society been in the service of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. Thus, Marx's and Engels' critical transcendence of ideological precursors assumes in the development of society an epochal significance inasmuch as it is itself a result of the actual process of history. The founders of Marxism have succeeded, from the positions of the proletariat, not only in creating a qualitatively new science of society but also in preserving the theoretical wealth of the most valuable results of social thinking. The work of Marx and Engels is, therefore, not only a testimony that the road to victory of the proletariat may be lit with the beacon of social development, but also a testimony that the preceding most important social teachings, which failed to comprehend the historical mission of the proletariat, have gradually lost contact with this real historical process. The revolutionary change which Marx and Engels have effected in philosophy, political economy, and socialist doctrine signifies therefore, at the same time, that these doctrines could not have further developed and intensified on their own basis in the direction of lending scientific understanding to social development and its driving forces.

The German classic philosophy, as a philosophical source of Marxism, achieved its apex in the system of Hegel. All previous philosophical teachings were consciously retained in it in the "abolished" form, and Hegel's philosophy, as the crowning peak of all preceding philosophical thinking, presented its claim to absolute knowledge. Hegel's philosophical self-confidence was supposedly, according to Hegelian system, an expression of the consciousness of the universal spirit which, looking at the history of the world as the result of its own work, reverts back to itself as an absolute idea. A political equivalent of this triumphal return to pure idea which had passed through the purgatory of the material world

was to be the Prussian state--"God's march on earth." Hegel's objectively idealistic premise and apologetic conclusion, so far as the Prussian social conditions were concerned, form here a unity. The very historical development of the preceding period was, however, reproduced in Hegel's system as a dialectic movement, a movement guided by its inner laws and proceeding in contradictions. Thus, because it pictured the lawfulness of the pattern of development of world spirit, Hegel captured in a hazy form the dialectical laws of actual social history. What frequently occurs on a different level in the natural sciences happened to Hegel: even a relatively false hypothesis often stimulates thinking, although in the effort to vindicate this hypothesis at any cost its true results are distorted.

Hegel's unquestionable achievement is that he further elaborated the active aspects of man in relation to nature and society. However, the more he reduced man to mere consciousness and the subject of his activity to a mere idea, the more he elaborated this aspect, as Marx has shown in his "Theses on Feuerbach" in the abstract sense only.

The fundamental contradictions between man and nature, and the contradictions within society itself, which appear in Hegel's works under the cover of estrangement, are for this philosopher spiritual contradictions the solution of which is again a matter of cognitive functions of the spirit. Self-consciousness as an expression of the active essence of man is for Hegel, therefore, not a consciousness of the actual conditions of existence of man but an expression of an abstract mode of knowledge, a companion to an equally abstract notion of freedom.

Bourgeois philosophy has thus in the monumental work of Hegel succeeded in making abundantly clear the contradictions of its own social foundation, and in presenting a mystified method of solving them.

Marx's critical process of transcending Hegel begins with the period when Marx published his first articles in the Rheinische Zeitung and in essence culminates in Marx's "Introduction to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right and Law." Marx's articles in the Rheinische Zeitung represent, from the point of view of revolutionary changes in philosophy, criticism of various aspects of precisely those German social conditions for which Hegel was an apologist in their purest Prussian form. Marx's articles in the Rheinische Zeitung can, therefore, be viewed as a preparatory work for the criticism of Hegel's philosophy, and all the more important because the criticism was based not on material of abstract philosophy but on facts of life. Marx, still from the position of a revolutionary democrat, began here for the first time to clarify for himself the role of popular masses in history.

The real critical act of crossing swords with Hegel's philosophy takes place only later in Marx's criticism of Hegel's philosophy of right and law. Here Marx, inspired by the method of Feuerbach's criticism of religious alienation of man, for the first time shows the fallacy of Hegel's idealistic starting point: the true subject of history is the people, and not the idea and its nearest manifestations -- the ruler and the state.

If in the Rheinische Zeitung articles Marx opposes the prevailing social conditions in their practical form, here he comes out for the first time against the fullest theoretical defense of them. Marx's criticism of Hegel's legal philosophy, therefore, constitutes a decisive turning point: here Marx for the first time separates himself from the bourgeois ideology.

This process takes final shape, so far as philosophical aspects are concerned, in Marx's "Introduction to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right and Law." With this work Marx definitely places himself, in the process of elaborating a qualitatively new concept of the world, against all bourgeois philosophy. Marx, and almost simultaneously and independently Engels, passes on to the position of the working class. The subject of liberation of society, the vehicle for overcoming the conditions of exploitation, will be the working class. Only this class, owing to its objective position in the system of bourgeois social relations, can be the vehicle of emancipation of all people.

Marx's discovery of the working class as the subject of revolutionary change of social conditions is the nucleus out of which grow, together with historical materialism, Marxist political economy and scientific socialism. It is accompanied by a discovery of the new importance and contents of human activity and at the same time a discovery of the material nature of objective social relations.

The proof of the historical mission of the working class is, in the "Introduction to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right and Law," presented in philosophical terms, just as a little later in Marx's and Engels' "Holy Family." This hypothesis is during the further development confirmed by the practice of class struggle of the proletariat. Proof of the historical mission of the proletariat, demonstrated by means of a special science of society, came, as Lenin showed, only with Marx's Capital. At this time Marx proceeds from the realization that the class of proletarians as the remotest pole of human self-estrangement is a negative part of bourgeois society and will not, for this reason, combine with its revolutionary victory any of the material conditions of permanent preservation of its own class supremacy.

The class of proletarians, standing against the prevalent conditions of bourgeois society, being the objective conditions which had developed in an elemental process, are destroying these conditions by their practical revolutionary activity. In its process the object

(social relations) and even the subject itself (the working class) undergo changes. The practical activity falls here into one with the revolution, which in the mature teachings of Marxism bears the name of socialist revolution. Marx's discovery of the historical mission of the working class, historically a new understanding of the practical activity, and the rise of the materialist conception of history as a historical nucleus of the whole Marxist philosophy form a unity. Only following this historical discovery can Marx formulate his famous "Theses on Feuerbach" -- another important step in the development of Marxism -- which is no longer a criticism of idealistic philosophy but a criticism of inconsistencies of pre-Marxian materialism.

Pre-Marxian materialism, though it has always been closely connected with natural sciences, understood to its own advantage the practical importance of human material activity only insofar as this activity could make the best use of natural sources for the satisfaction of fixed and unalterable human needs. Man was in its eyes a passive product of nature which is in its essence unchangeable. It did not understand that the masses of producers, because of the fact that they change nature, are also changing themselves, the content and extent of their needs, that they change the whole society.

The social existence itself was Marx's discovery of the historical role of the working class comprehended as the object of purposeful practical human activity. This actual subject, then, this object, becomes the foundation of all social relations -- the production relations. The purposeful activity aiming at the transformation of these production relations is a practical, material, and revolutionary activity. It is a social revolution and its subject is the revolutionary proletariat. The task of critical and revolutionary social science is for Marx and Engels, then, to justify scientifically the historical mission of the proletariat and to provide it, proceeding from its experiences, with a practical program, strategy, and tactics for its struggle.

Without the existence of the revolutionary working class it would not even be possible to link dialectics with materialism. It is precisely in the teachings of Marx and Engels about the historical role of the working class and in their subsequent scientific proof of the inevitable fall of capitalism and rise of socialism that materialist dialectics, historical materialism, political economy, and scientific socialism merge into one whole. Materialist dialectics becomes at the same time a general method of all parts of Marxism.

The rise of the materialist conception of history thus somewhat antedates the rise of the other parts of Marxism. Its rise then brings along, at least in a nucleus, the rise of the remaining parts of Marxism. If, as V. I. Lenin says, "The main point of

Marxist teaching is ... its explanation of the world-wide role of the proletariat as the creator of socialist society" (V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 18, p. 583), then all three of its component parts serve this purpose in Marxism in equal measure.

If the historical mission of the working class is determined by its objective position in the system of bourgeois social relations which develop in an elemental way as a natural historical process, it would be first of all necessary to examine this system of relations and the laws of its movement. The transition of Marx and Engels to the position of the working class necessitates an examination of the economic foundation of social relations -- the production relations. The first prerequisite of this study was the critical re-examination of earlier theories of political economy. The first results of this critical duel with English bourgeois political economy are found in Marx's "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts" and the early works of Engels from England.

Hegel's philosophy purports to show the real share of Germans in earlier history; it reduces human work to thinking, and man to consciousness. English political economy in its most mature form looked upon man as the producer of commodities who participates in social relations only insofar as he exchanges these commodities. If Hegel subordinates social development to the general laws of movement of objective spirit for which men are mere instruments, English political economy subordinates the social movement forever to the laws of commodity economy in which men participate as owners of commodities; "this alienated form of social relations" -- Marx says in his notes on James Mill -- "political economy accepts as fundamental and primary and as corresponding to the mission of mankind. Political economy -- as well as the real movement -- accepts as the starting point the relation of man to man, as private owner to private owner." (MEGA III, page 537 [presumably Marx and Engels, -- *Gesammelte Werke* -- Collected Works]). Private property was a theoretical foundation and an unchangeable category of English political economy. Marx, just as Engels before him, criticized English political economy as a theoretical expression of the existing conditions of the mature English capitalist society. Thence the criticism by Marx and Engels of the inhuman nature of these teachings. The consistent viewpoint of the proletariat makes it possible for Marx and Engels, in distinction to earlier socialists, to disclose the contradictory nature of private as the foundation of class antagonism in bourgeois society. In his "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts" Marx sets the grandiose task of scientific criticism of the economic foundation of bourgeois social relations: " ... to understand the fundamental interrelationship between private property and the greedy pursuit of profit, the separation between the work of capital and landed property, the link between exchange and competition, between the value of man and his depreciation,



between monopoly and competition, etc., between all these separations and the monetary system" (MEGA III, page 82). In the process of criticism of English political economy Marx then creates, with the help of Engels, methodological prerequisites for subsequent systematic completion of the labor theory of value, for uncovering the origin of surplus value and the development of capital.

Marx's criticism of bourgeois political economy, in the course of which Marx ascertains the economic foundations of the social position and the mission of the working class, is a criticism of actual estrangement of man as producer under the bourgeois system of private ownership of the means of production. This criticism is, therefore, a direct continuation of Marx's criticism of the idealistic foundation of Hegel's philosophy where the idea of estrangement, used as a universal category, is conceived of as a purely cognitive matter.

For Marx, abolition of human estrangement means abolition of objective conditions separating the results of human labor and its very process as it pertains to the real producer -- the worker. To abolish this separation, therefore, is to expropriate the capitalists; it is a revolution in the course of which the proletariat takes over by force the means of production.

Marx's criticism of bourgeois political economy would not be possible without the preceding philosophical realization of the social role of material practice which produces not only goods but also objective social conditions. This criticism itself, which discloses the true role of human labor in the rise and development of capitalism, retroactively enriched Marx's philosophy; it expanded the knowledge of the relation of man to the material conditions of his existence -- conditions which are not merely natural but also social as an objective product of human activity. Thus, the rise of Marxist political economy as a special science was at the same time an unfolding of Marxist philosophy.

An all-round unfolding of materialist teaching of the class struggle of the proletariat as a product of capitalist production relations, of its aims and culmination in socialist revolution, was to Marx and Engels, first of all, a matter of scientific socialism.

Scientific socialism as an organic part of Marxism arises on the basis of examination of the previous development of class struggles and a critical re-evaluation of utopian socialism, vulgar communism, and pre-Marxist theories of class struggle.

Pre-Marxist utopian socialism, which in its criticism proceeded from the manifestations of inner antagonisms perceptible in bourgeois society, was invented as a ready-made plan of harmonious arrangement of social relations. The great pre-Marxist utopians wanted to teach the workers to live according to their own ideas. Between their illusory plan and the life and practice of the proletarian masses was a vast gap. The only bridge which linked the reality and the goal was to be the power of example and the

human capability of careful imitation. The aim seemed, as it happens, as a rule, closer when it was worked out in the minutest detail. The theoretical impossibility of utopian socialism was proved by Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto. Utopian socialism did not even come close to discovering the material conditions for realization of its aims, nor did it discover a certain class whose historical mission would be to make socialism come true. The proletariat, in whose name utopian socialists often spoke, was for these advocates of justice a mere pitiful exploited victim and not a revolutionary subject of liberation of the working masses.

Addressing such utopians as Owen and Fourier, Marx wrote in his "Theses on Feuerbach" the following: "The materialist doctrine that men are products of environment and upbringing, and that, therefore, changed men are products of other environments and changed upbringing, forgets that it is men who change the environment and that the educator must himself be educated. Hence, this doctrine necessarily arrives at dividing society into two parts, of which one is superior to society... The coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity can be conceived and rationally understood only as revolutionizing practice."

The opposite of the utopian efforts to overcome the bourgeois system of exploitation was the conspiratorial attempts of vulgar pre-Marxist communism. The contention that it is possible to get rid of the supremacy of the bourgeoisie by a conspiracy of a group of individuals utterly devoted to their ideals was based on the same metaphysical divorce of dream from reality. Where the socialist utopians extolled the power of example as a means of attaining their goal, the pre-Marxist advocates of economic ideas relied upon the elemental and communistic feelings of the exploited masses.

Marx dealt with the criticism of vulgar communism in his manuscripts. There he says about it: "This communism which denies everywhere the personality of man is merely a consistent expression of private property which is thereby denied." (MEGA III, page 586.)

Especially important from the point of view of overcoming utopian socialism by Marxism is Marx's criticism of Proudhon. The divergence of utopian socialism from the real process of social development had, in the doctrine of Proudhon, an especially harmful effect in relation to the expanding struggle of the working class. Proudhon's aim was to stop the historical development which was leading to the proletarianization of the middle class. No one among the pre-Marxist socialists appealed more strongly to the theological notions of destiny and eternal ideas. Criticizing the ideological substance of the reactionary theses of Proudhon's doctrines, Marx and Engels proved that the French political concepts of abstract equality on which pre-Marxist socialism had operated are, in essence, upside down real aims of the bourgeoisie equivalent to Hegel's idea of self-consciousness.

Refuting abstract ideas of equality, freedom, and justice as a means of overcoming the "injustices" of the bourgeois order, derived purely from the Age of Enlightenment, Marx and Engels examine the real movement of society which occurs in the process of class struggles which are, in their mature form, always political struggles. For Marx and Engels here the study of the leading historians of the French Restoration, who first discovered the historical importance of class struggle, was, so far as theoretical consequences are concerned, of great significance although they restricted this discovery to the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the representatives of the feudal order.

Marx and Engels, while developing the materialist teaching of the historical mission of the proletariat, proved for the first time in the Communist Manifesto that the class struggle of the proletariat inevitably culminates in the seizure of political power by the proletariat and in the use of this power for socialization of the means of production. Marx's and Engels' theory of class struggle is thus from its very beginning linked with the theory of socialist revolution and is the foundation for working out the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The scientific socialism of Marx, in distinction to the preceding socialist doctrines, has thus, from its very beginning, placed a tremendous emphasis on politics.

The rise of Marxism as a critical refutation of the theoretical predecessors of Marx and Engels is a process in the course of which Marxism separates itself as a scientific ideology of the working class from the body of the bourgeois ideology and later also from the ideology of pre-Marxist socialism.

The indivisibility of the three component parts of Marxism, which in perverted form--on the idealistic foundation--existed separately before Marx, constitutes the main historical task of Marxism: to present an all-round explanation of the historical mission of the working class. Thus, from the beginning of the activity of Marx and Engels, Marxism contains, from the standpoint of its main task, the general materialist doctrine on dialectic laws of development of the world and society (philosophy), the doctrine on the objective position of the working class in the system of production relations of bourgeois society (political economy), and the doctrine of class struggle, subjective and objective conditions of the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie (scientific socialism). Marxist philosophy forms an independent part of Marxism and, like materialist dialectics, is a theoretical and methodological foundation of the other two parts of Marxism. These parts are, however, not a result of its merely mechanical application since the very unfolding of materialist dialectics is unthinkable without an elaboration of Marx's political economy and scientific socialism.

\* \* \*

Marxism owes the inner unity of its three parts first of all to materialist dialectics as the most general doctrine of the laws of movement of nature, society, and thought. Materialist dialectics, applied to an objective as method of understanding, discovers by means of analysis of its inner contradictions the driving force of its movement and development which can be used for a purposeful change of the object itself. Materialist dialectics, as a method of understanding is, therefore, an instrument for transforming the material world.

The general methodological importance of materialist dialectics makes the inner unity of the three parts of Marxism-Leninism in its elementary form project itself into Marxist philosophy, which is the unifying foundation of this entire doctrine. The unity of Marxism-Leninism, then, is reflected in Marxist philosophy as the unity of materialism and dialectics. Any separation of political economy from socialism is, therefore, a violation of the general methodological instructions of Marxist philosophy and is always harmful to its integrity, its organic unity of materialism and dialectics. Thus, separation of one of the three parts of Marxism necessarily leads to substitution of metaphysical thinking or sophistry for materialist dialectics and to a degradation of Marxism either to the level of bourgeois objectivism and the theory of elementality in the interpretation of socialist phenomena, or to a voluntaristic and sectarian understanding of the tasks of the proletariat and its political party. The history of the old and contemporary revisionism furnishes a wealth of examples of theoretical and practical political consequences of disturbing the inner unity of Marxism-Leninism.

Eduard Bernstein, while dealing mostly with political economy, tries to separate the proof of the historical mission of the working class from the real movement of the proletariat and its material foundation in bourgeois production conditions, as a matter allegedly derived from unconfirmed philosophical premises. Bernstein attempts to transform Marx's socialism into bourgeois reformism by suppressing materialist dialectics as the methodological foundation of scientific political economy and socialism. The liquidation of materialist dialectics, on the contrary, caused a disruption between economic teaching and socialism, turning them into unconnected disciplines one of which was meant to describe the tendencies of economic development and the other only to register elemental action of the working class.

The disruption of the inner unity of Marxism-Leninism is being attempted by different means, although in the contemporary currents of revisionism it leads to similar consequences. Thus, the Hegelizing representative of contemporary revisionism, H. Lefebvre, represents Marxism as having two incompatible orientations: that of the representatives of Marxist-Leninist politics who, while defending the course of socialism in practice, allegedly

alienate themselves from Marxist philosophy, and that of the philosophers who have nothing to do with the policy of Communist parties but who, allegedly, develop Marxist philosophy. And without hesitation Lefebvre includes in the second category the bourgeois "Marxologists," members of the order of the Society of Jesus, Chambre and Calveze (see H. Lefebvre, *Marxism and French Thought*, Les Temps Modernes, 1957, page 137).

Scientific socialism as the scientific foundation of practical policy and Marxist philosophy as a conception of the world, expressed in the most general features in the work of Lefebvre, fall apart. The Marxist philosophy itself, however, assumes hereby the nature of bourgeois philosophy: in theoretical respect it is deprived of its materialist foundation (see Lefebvre's argument against objective dialectics in "Current Problems of Marxism."), in practical respect it becomes an ally of bourgeois policy and hostile propaganda against the camp of socialism. Lefebvre separates philosophy from the real process of social development and does so despite all declarations about the necessity of a philosophically integral view of social reality.

Another example of the distressing consequences of inner destruction of Marxism-Leninism carried out with intent to liquidate is the recent publication of the book *Marxism is a question*, by P. Fougeyrollase (Paris, 1959, ed. du Seuil). Repudiation of the historically verified theoretical contents of scientific socialism and the indispensability of the dictatorship of the proletariat is here "methodically" carried out by pulling the workers movement out of production relations examined by Marxist political economy. The external trimmings referred to in this operation are the technocratic theories of Simone Weil and Burnham. Hand in hand with these revisionist attacks against the inner unity of Marxism goes the subjectivization of materialist dialectics of Fougeyrollase.

Thus, every revisionist attempt conspiring against the inner unity of Marxism-Leninism is always imbedded in the actions against the inner unity of Marxist philosophy itself. This is so because, as an organic part of Marxist philosophy, materialist dialectics is an indispensable part of Marxism as a whole, of Marxism in all its parts. In this sense dialectics is the "soul" of Marxism, it is its methodological foundation and unifying principle. The laws of materialist dialectics manifest themselves in Marxist political economy just as much as in scientific socialism; a denial of the laws discovered by these parts of Marxism is thus only a special case of denying the existence of laws of materialist dialectics in general.

The inner unity of Marxism-Leninism makes it impossible for example, to be a Marxist, in political economy and not be a Marxist in questions of socialism, politics, or philosophy. Equally, so, of course, it is not possible to be a consistent Marxist in philosophy and not to know or to deny the theorems of Marxist political

economy. Lack of knowledge of Marxist political economy and of the theory of scientific socialism is for a philosopher who presents himself as a Marxist merely a testimony that his philosophical views, even if subjectively documented by quotation from Marx, have been suspended in the vacuum of abstraction, outside space and time of real social events.

Materialist dialectics and political economy of Marxism (just as scientific socialism) stand, in respect to method, in general and in particular, in relation to each other. When Marx says in the introduction to Capital that in the analysis of economic forms "it is impossible to use either a microscope or chemical reactions," he has in mind abstraction as the instrument of understanding -- not an abstraction of common school-like logic but an abstraction for the truthfulness of which answers none other than materialist dialectics. For this reason no Marxist economist can correctly approach the study of special sources, or truthfully explain material which he absorbed in his study, if he has not mastered the fundamentals of materialist dialectics. In the opposite case there is danger of flat empiricism or empty speculation. Even in the reverse case it is, however, necessary to emphasize that an elaboration of materialist dialectics, even though it might take place on the basis of special material of the natural sciences, is unthinkable without taking into consideration the theoretical wealth of both remaining parts of Marxism-Leninism.

It was precisely this inner relationship between the dialectic aspect of Marxist philosophy and the concrete material of political economy and scientific socialism that Lenin had in mind when he stressed that from the "point of view of Marx and Engels philosophy has no right to special and independent existence, and its material falls into various branches of positive science. As a philosophical justification it is, therefore, possible to understand either confrontation of their requisites with firmly fixed laws of other sciences ... or the experiences derived from the application of this theory." (V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 1, p1435).

This thought of Lenin, was, after the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, taken out of the historical polemic and the context of the complete works of Lenin and interpreted by some young philosophers even in the Soviet Union as a confirmation of the supposition that Marxist philosophy does not exist as an independent scientific discipline. This, however, is a misinterpretation of the concrete contents of this thought of Lenin. In reality, the aforementioned thesis does not speak in favor of liquidating tendencies in philosophy but merely emphasizes the unifying importance of Marxist philosophy for the whole of Marxism-Leninism.

For us the model of the inner unity of the Marxist-Leninist teaching about society remains first of all the work of the classics of Marxism-Leninism themselves. The inner unity of the three parts has been formed not according to a preconceived and logically

arranged plan but in the process of struggles and polemics with those currents which in the interest of the proletarian movement had to be separated from the working class and its revolutionary party. Each work of the classics of Marxism-Leninism, therefore, dealt with a certain historical range of problems which in their contents are concerned with one of the three parts of Marxism-Leninism.

In this sense we distinguish among the classics of Marxism-Leninism works primarily economic, philosophic, or political. None of these works, however, can be truthfully proclaimed to be "professionally" narrowly philosophical, economic, or especially "politico-theoretical." This is so because narrow expertness, as a consequence of divisions of labor and tasks imparted into the examined subjects from without, regardless of inner laws, inner diversifications and life, is absolutely alien to Marxism. Marx and Engels, and Lenin after them, devoted in various works predominant attention to philosophy, economics, or the questions of scientific socialism depending on the aspect of the struggle of the working class which at a given moment was decisive for the future victory of the proletariat.

When examining questions of politics, economics, or philosophy, the classics of Marxism-Leninism never lost sight of the theoretical whole of Marxism -- its inner unity. The work of the classics of Marxism-Leninism is, therefore, proof that individual parts of Marxism-Leninism form a dialectic unit which itself is a reflection and rational expression of the objective relations between certain and particular historical tasks of the proletariat. Lenin says about it: "Considering the wealth and manifold forms of the ideological contents of Marxism, it is not peculiar that ... various historical periods emphasize one and then another aspect of Marxism. In Russia before the revolution it was especially important to apply Marx's economic teaching to our reality, at the time of the revolution it was Marxist policy that won special importance, and after the revolution -- Marxist philosophy." (V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 17, p. 67.) Lenin adds at the same time, however, that emphasizing one or another part in the development of Marxism should by no means be construed as meaning that "it is admissible to ignore at any time certain aspects of Marxism; it only means that the preponderance of interest in one or another aspect does not depend on subjective wishes but on the sum total of historical conditions." (Ibid.)

In this way Lenin points out an important fact which some would-be ideologists of the working class like to forget: that the choice of tasks of a theorist within a Marxist-Leninist party, however much the result of his work overshadows the empirical horizon of the prevalent practice, is always subordinated to the concrete needs of the movement. Out of the historical sum total of these needs -- objective needs, and in every given situation quite definite needs -- there grows, in the course of historical development, the whole of Marxism-Leninism as an organic unity of its parts.

The greatness of Marx and Engels as much as that of Lenin rests in the subordination of theoretical activity to the objective needs of the workers movement and in elaborating at the same time a scientific ideology of the working class in all its aspects down to vast theoretical depth. Lenin's work, like that of Marx and Engels, historically conceived in the selection of its politics and the method of timely solving the problems, forms a dialectic unity with the real historical process. The theoretical struggle in the sphere of philosophy, or political economy or the actual application of scientific socialism in politics is here a reflection and a part of the basic forms of the struggle of the proletariat inadvertently appearing on the scene of history, the ideological economic and political struggle. Just as in life these forms of struggle do not exist independently but are closely connected with each other forming an inner unity, so the forms of their rational expression in Marxism-Leninism also form an internally monolithic oneness. The common denominator in practice and theory is here the objective goal of the revolutionary movement discovered by science -- dictatorship of the proletariat and the victory of socialism and communism.

\* \* \*

Qualitatively new tasks confront Marxist-Leninist theory in the period of transition to socialism. In this situation the task of the Marxism-Leninist party as the leading force of the working class and the working masses is no longer that of opposing in its own country the natural historical bourgeois social order, bred in antagonism. Today, in the period of completion of socialism in the Czechoslovak Republic, the task of our Communist Party, as the leading and organizing force in the development of the whole social life, is in a certain sense more varied and demanding than under capitalism and the direct conflict with the class enemy. The all-round social tasks of the Communist Party are a result of the fact that even after a complete victory of socialism the party, as a proved leader of the working masses, remains the directing and leading force of all important processes of social life. The party becomes here the main directing and regulating organ, first of all of the objective processes which are taking place in socialist economics. In no lesser degree, however, grows also its regulating role in the purposeful management of the superstructural processes of social life and in the sphere of rounded education and re-education of the working masses in the spirit of socialism. Thus communists are faced with tasks of a scope and manifold nature never dreamed of by the representatives of the capitalist order, which develops in an elemental way.

Some comrades, while comparing in their minds socialist social order with contemporary capitalism acerbated by production anarchy and dominated by pursuit of the highest possible profits, with a multicolored palette of ideological currents ranging from medieval obscurantism to intellectualistic fantasies, arrive hastily at the



conclusion that socialism as a socioeconomic formation is in every respect simpler than the bourgeois order. These comrades, however, confuse two things: the conspicuous colorfulness of decadent manifestations of elemental social processes in the camp of capitalism and the real objective diversification and all-inclusiveness of social processes which take place without advertisement but all the more surely in the camp of socialism. From the point of view of objective social structure, the capitalist order as a result of the blind development of commodity relations which degrade the human personality and its needs in every respect is an order historically lower and also simpler than socialism.

The socialist order, which develops the production forces of society in a planned manner and strengthens social ownership, means a gradual purposeful control over social processes, a government of living labor over dead labor, a growing rule of men over things, and a satisfaction of the needs of men to an extent not comparable to anything previously existing. Beginning with economic processes and ending with the creation of artistic works and their enjoyment, socialism creates more varied and intensive relations among men, releases creative human powers, and creates higher needs which are not possible under capitalism. Socialism for the first time creates conditions for an all-round social assertion of the individual, and assertion which is not a priori measured by his participation in monetary relations.

The process of completing the material and technical foundation of socialism, accompanied by far-reaching changes in the class structure of society and manifold changes in the way of life of the broadest working masses, socialist reforms of education, the process of completing cultural revolution, the social results of shortening working hours, the gradual emancipation of women from household work -- all this places exceptionally demanding tasks on the theory of Marxism-Leninism as the scientific foundation of the directing activity of the party.

With a certain simplification it is possible to say that today Marxist theory faces in our conditions two groups of questions: the first, which is more and more coming to the fore, is in its significance connected with the need to make general knowledge of the empirical experiences from building socialism and the application of Marxist-Leninist theory in the practice of its construction. In connection with the main task -- completion of the material and technical foundation of socialism from the standpoint of cognitive and generalizing activity of the party, questions of economic theory still stand in the forefront. These are the questions, as the 11th Congress of the KSC again emphasized, to which it is first necessary to direct our attention both in developing Marxist-Leninist theory and in the ideological education of party members and the working masses. Along with this main task, as was also stressed by the 11th Congress of the KSC, other aspects of Marxism-Leninism must not be neglected.

The second group of problems, in dealing with which it is necessary to marshal the entire theoretical wealth of Marxism-Leninism, is connected with the demand for the most effective fight on the ideological front. Especially in recent years has the necessity of an effective, penetrating, and convincing criticism of bourgeois ideology and of the revisionist onslaughts come to the fore. The prospect of peaceful coexistence, continually insured by the indefatigable efforts of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp, offers principled ideological struggle as an indispensable factor in the peaceful competition with capitalism.

The manifold tasks which our epoch of the completion of socialist construction and gradual transition to communism imposes on Marxist-Leninist theory can be successfully fulfilled only on condition that the division of labor, indispensable for a profound elaboration of certain problems and questions, not have as a result harmful splitting of the inner unity of Marxism-Leninism.

The historical justification of this demand stems from the fact that socialism can be built only through the conscious activity of the people while maintaining and expanding the central management by the party of all socially important processes with growing participation of the working people in the management and administration of social life. The inner unity of Marxism-Leninism is here a theoretical prerequisite of the very ideological unity of the party and the starting point of the moral and political unity of the people.

Considering the complexity and diversity of the theoretical and educational tasks, it is also necessary to insure the prerequisites for the fulfillment of the demand for strengthening the inner unity of Marxism-Leninism.

The demand for the division of labor, or rather specialization, has often led, among various working units and theoretical workers in the recent past, to a professionalistic conception of the individual tasks and questions of Marxist-Leninist teaching. Permanent handling of certain individual parts of Marxism-Leninism by various workers of the ideological front and the historically justified efforts to promote specialization in particular questions within these parts have frequently resulted in disregard for the total Marxist conception of the given problem.

In the past we have had a chance to observe the consequences of a lifeless and professionalistic conception of specialization in the teaching of Marxist-Leninist theory in some philosophic and pedagogic working units, particularly in the field of philosophy.

Because of preferred professional interests of certain officials there had appeared, on the one hand, elements of a positivistic conception of the important questions of dialectical materialism, a conception which stands apart from the social conditions of the development of human understanding, and, on the other hand, no less harmful attempts to substitute speculative means of philosophy for the cognitive functions of the social significance of the other two

remaining parts of Marxism-Leninism, to elevate philosophy above the real process of history and the actual tasks of the party. These tendencies in our philosophy were examined and justly condemned in the resolution of our party of last year concerning philosophy. Insufficient knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, as an internally integral teaching, is one of the causes of serious shortcomings in the practice of some comrades, the resolution specified.

The present stage in our development especially urgently requires of every worker in the social sciences all-round theoretical training no matter what sector of the theory of Marxism-Leninism he is entrusted with, a training which includes, besides a good knowledge of a particular section of Marxism-Leninism, also a solid knowledge of the rest of it. It is exactly the necessary process of expanding specialization on the one hand and the objective need for thorough examination of all socially important phenomena on the other that impose the urgent demand on the ideological workers to expand his professional knowledge in one part of Marxism-Leninism while keeping up his study of it as a whole. Only in this way will he be able to meet the demand of contemporary practice. The most important aid is a thorough going study of the theoretical heritage of the classics of Marxism-Leninism. Its integrity and inner thematic diversifications have a most profound effect on the unity of Marxism-Leninism. A well-prepared textbook of political economy, scientific socialism, and communist and Marxist philosophy would be extremely helpful. The new Soviet textbook on the foundations of Marxism-Leninism which is now being translated into Czech is an example of a successful attempt to bring Marxism-Leninism, as an integral and internally uniform teaching of the contemporary problems of socialism and communism, closer to the reader.

In the interest of further strengthening the inner unity of Marxism-Leninism in theoretical and educational work, there is, however, an objective condition of no minor importance: the practice of charging individual workers of the ideological front with various tasks and problems cannot, as has so far been the case, be left to local methods. Assignment of the main tasks to individual workers, if it is really to proceed from objective laws of previous development of Marxism-Leninism, can be done centrally only and in compliance with the objective needs of our social development. The decisive work here falls on the Communist Party and its supreme organs. Only through purposeful planning in the vital sectors of the social sciences, central coordination of the assigned tasks under the initiative of individual working units and with due consideration for their special conditions as well as theoretical preparedness, and last but not least the aptitude of individuals, will our social theory be in a position to fulfill the great tasks imposed by the contemporary stage of the completion of socialist construction.